

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
8 **WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**  
9 **AT SEATTLE**

10 HAYTHAMANI MOHAMED HASSAN,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 THE BOEING COMPANY, a Delaware  
14 corporation,

15 Defendant.

Case No. 2:22-cv-01345-RSM

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO EXTEND  
DEADLINE FOR DISCOVERY RELATED  
MOTIONS

16 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Hassan's "Motion to Extend Deadline for  
17 Discovery Related Motions." Dkt. #51. Plaintiff points out that certain discovery events will  
18 occur after the Court's deadline for the filing of discovery motions. Plaintiff requests that the  
19 deadline for motions be extended until after discovery is completed. *Id.*

20  
21 A scheduling order "may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent."  
22 Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). The decision to modify a scheduling order is within the broad discretion  
23 of the district court. *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 607 (9th Cir. 1992).  
24 "Rule 16(b)'s 'good cause' standard primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking  
25 amendment." *Id.* at 609. If a party has acted diligently yet still cannot reasonably meet the  
26 scheduling deadlines, the court may allow modification of the schedule. *Id.* "Mere failure to

1 complete discovery within the time allowed does not constitute good cause for an extension or  
2 continuance.” LCR 16(b)(6). This rule will be “strictly enforced” in order to “accomplish  
3 effective pretrial procedures and avoid wasting the time of the parties, counsel, and the court.”  
4 LCR 16(m). While prejudice to an opposing party may provide additional reasons for denying  
5 the motion, it is not required under Rule 16(b). *Coleman v. Quaker Oats Co.*, 232 F.3d 1271,  
6 1295 (9th Cir. 2000).  
7

8 The discovery motion deadline in the scheduling order is not unique to this case and is by  
9 design. The Court has traditionally required the filing of discovery motions prior to the close of  
10 discovery to allow for the resolution of discovery issues without disrupting subsequent deadlines  
11 like the filing of dispositive motions.  
12

13 Plaintiff’s Motion includes no specific discovery concern and fails to explain why he was  
14 unable to conduct discovery earlier in this case. Plaintiff fails to demonstrate diligence or good  
15 cause for the requested relief.

16 Accordingly, having reviewed the briefing and the remainder of the record, the Court  
17 hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff Hassan’s Motion to Extend Deadline for Discovery  
18 Related Motions, Dkt. #51, is DENIED.  
19

20 DATED this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of January, 2025.

21 

22 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
24  
25  
26